

Notice of Allowability	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/662,615	OVERSTREET, EDWARD H.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	George Manuel	3762	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--*

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. This communication is responsive to the amendment, filed 3/21/06.
2. The allowed claim(s) is/are 20-39.
3. Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some*
 - c) None
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.
THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
5. CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
 - (a) including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
 - 1) hereto or 2) to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
 - (b) including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.

Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2. Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3. Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date _____
4. Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material
5. Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6. Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date _____.
7. Examiner's Amendment/Comment
8. Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
9. Other _____.

DETAILED ACTION

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Bryant R. Gold on 6/6/06.

The application has been amended as follows:

In claim 28, line 2, replace "whose" with –using—.
line 2, delete "are well described".

In claim 38, line 2, replace "whose" with –using—.
line 2, delete "are well described".

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 20-39 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Applying electrical stimuli to groups of electrodes and monitoring stapedial reflexes for temporal and spatial integration to control the intensity of electrical stimuli following the integration as claimed is not taught nor suggested by the prior art of record. Further, applying electrical stimuli to three or more adjacent electrode contacts and using the stapedial reflexes from the stimuli to control the intensity of additional electrical stimuli to the electrode contacts does not appear to be an obvious extrapolation of single channel stapedial reflex monitoring because multi-channel stimuli

create spatial resolution difficulties that do not appear intuitive to resolve for an associated stapedial reflex.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Faltys et al '861 teach single channel monitoring of stapedial reflexes. There lacks a teaching or suggestion to monitor the stapedial reflexes for spatial integration based on a group of electrical stimuli.

Faltys et al '580 teach multi-channel stimulation; however, combining the stimulation with stapedial reflexes is not disclosed nor an obvious modification to combine.

Carter et al '360 disclose a multi-electrode intracochlear array and sensing electrical activity of the stapesius muscle. However, the stapedius signals are processed based on a predetermined algorithm to define a maximum comfortable stimulation level and do not appear to be capable of being used to alter post array stimuli based on temporal and spatial integration responses, or the stimuli of three or more adjacent electrodes, of previous array stimuli.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Manuel whose telephone number is (571) 272-4952.



George Manuel
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 3762